

19 September 1978

MEMORANDUM OF CONVERSATION

SUBJECT: Indications & Warning

1. The DCI, DDCI, Shackley, and I discussed the question of how the indications and warning function should be organized.
2. The Director had indicated that he leaned toward Proposal D of the working group paper of September 8th. I argued:
  - a. that this report confused the warning function with that of crisis management which should be quite separate and,
  - b. would confuse the authority of the Director of NFAC for the analytical work which was at the heart of the warning function.
3. After discussion, the Director decided that the following organization should be adopted:
  - a. The principal warning officer in the Agency would be an NIO for Warning. This would be his primary function and he would have authority to oversee the performance of the warning function by other NIOs and the office staffs.
  - b. State and Defense would be asked to designate a similar warning officer probably in DIA and INR.
  - c. The NIO would serve as a chairman of these three which would constitute a warning working group.

S E C R E T

d. an NFIB subcommittee on warning would be created with the DDCI as chairman. This subcommittee would not concern itself with the substantive functions of deciding on warning but would oversee or supervise the working of the system. Approximately monthly the working group on warning would report on its activities to this NFIB subcommittee.

e. Strategic Warning Staff would report to the DCI through the NIO if this can be worked out with the Defense Department.

f. The DCI asked Lehman and me to meet with him and General Tighe this afternoon to get the concurrence of Defense on this set up.

Robert R. Bowie

S E C R E T